

“Palæolithic Man in Africa.” By Sir JOHN EVANS, K.C.B., F.R.S.
Received May 15,—Read May 31, 1900.

In April, 1896, just four years ago, I ventured to call the attention of the Society* to some palæolithic implements found in Somaliland by Mr. H. W. Seton-Karr. In doing so, I pointed out the absolute identity in form of these implements with those from the valley of the Somme and numerous other pleistocene deposits in North-western Europe and elsewhere; and I cited others from the high land adjoining the valley of the Nile and from other places in Northern and Southern Africa. I was at the same time careful to point out that though there could be no doubt as to this identity in form, no fossil mammalian or other remains had been found with these African implements. I did not, however, hesitate in claiming them as palæolithic.

Since the publication of my short note, an extensive collection of stone implements formed in Egypt by Mr. H. W. Seton-Karr has been acquired by the Mayer Museum at Liverpool. I have not had an opportunity of examining the specimens, but a detailed account† of them, with numerous illustrations, has been published by the Director of the Liverpool Museums, Dr. H. O. Forbes. The majority of the implements are of Neolithic Age or even of more recent date, and with the account of these I need not here concern myself; but the author is at considerable pains to dispute my view that the instruments of palæolithic forms belong to the Palæolithic Period. As he says, Mr. Seton-Karr’s statement that he sometimes found spear-heads “on the ground surrounded by a mass of flakes and chips as though the people had dropped their work and fled,” is very suggestive and important. He adds, however, that “one such occurrence is almost sufficient in itself, I venture to think, to disprove the high antiquity claimed by Sir John Evans for these implements.”

Were it certain that the so-called spear-heads were really of palæolithic form, and had the flakes and chips been fitted on to them so as to reconstitute the original blocks of flint, as has been done in the case of undoubted palæolithic specimens by Mr. Spurrell and Mr. Worthington Smith, the question would still remain to be discussed as to the condition of the localities in relation to subærial denudation.

It is, however, hardly necessary to discuss these points, as some recent discoveries made in Algeria will, I venture to think, go a long way towards settling the question. I propose, therefore, very briefly to state their nature. About sixty miles to the south-west of the town

* ‘Roy. Soc. Proc.’ vol. 60, p. 19.

† ‘Bull. Liverp. Mus.’ II, Nos. 3 and 4 (Jan. 20, 1900); ‘Nature,’ April 19, 1900, p. 597.

of Oran, and about ten miles to the north of Tlemcen, on the plateau of Remchi, about a mile to the south of the River Isser, lies a small lake known as Lac Karâr. It occupies a depression in lacustrine limestone of comparatively recent geological date, superimposed on beds of Lower Miocene Age. The level of the water, which is some 15° centigrade warmer than that of the ordinary springs of the district, and appears to be derived from some deep-seated source, seems to be about 600 feet higher than that of the River Isser. The lake originally filled a much larger part of the depression than it now does, and from its old bed a considerable amount of material has of late years been extracted for the Service des Ponts et Chaussées. This material consists of sand and gravel rich in iron pyrites, in the midst of which lie, pell-mell, bones of animals and stone implements fashioned by the hand of man.

These have for some years been diligently collected by M. Louis Gentil, a geologist, and form the subject of a memoir that has just appeared in 'l'Anthropologie'* by my friend M. Marcellin Boule, of the Galerie de Paléontologie at the Jardin des Plantes, Paris. Some 200 specimens of implements have been submitted to him, of various sizes, and all or nearly all of well-known palæolithic forms, including several with a broad chisel-like end, of which examples have been found in the laterite of Madras and the gravels of Madrid. They are for the most part formed of an eocene quartzite, though some smaller specimens of the type known as that of "le Moustier" are formed of flint. The *facies* of these latter is not so distinctly palæolithic as that of the former, of which some, through the kindness of M. Marcellin Boule, are exhibited.

The most important part of the discovery is that which relates to the mammalian remains found with the implements. These are of elephant, rhinoceros, horse, hippopotamus, pig, ox, sheep, and certain cervidæ. I will not detain the Society with the details given in M. Boule's memoir, but I may call attention to the fact that the elephant is not the African elephant, but one more nearly related to the quaternary or even pliocene elephants of Europe, to which the designation *Atlanticus* has been given. Some teeth seem closely allied to those of *E. meridionalis* and even *E. armeniacus*. Having regard to the whole fauna, M. Boule arrives at the conclusion that it is identical with that of the fossiliferous deposits of Algeria, which from their topographical or stratigraphical characteristics have been assigned to the Quaternary or Pleistocene Period. He also cites other instances in Algeria, such as Ternifine and a station near Aboukir, in which palæolithic implements have been found associated with the remains of a similar pleistocene fauna.

Altogether, these recent discoveries in Northern Africa tend immensely

* Tome XI, 1900.

to strengthen my position with regard to the truly palæolithic character of the implements found in other parts of that vast continent, and I am tempted to bring for comparison some few specimens from South Africa. One of these, found by Mr. J. C. Rickard at the junction of the Riet and Modder twenty years ago, is almost indistinguishable from those of the Lac Karâr, as is also one from the valley of the Embabaa in Swaziland. But the most remarkable is an implement of typically palæolithic character found in 1873 under 9 feet of stratified beds at Process-fontein, Victoria West, by Mr. E. J. Dunn.* May the day be not long distant when researches for the implements of palæolithic man may again be carried on, and trenches be dug in South Africa for peaceful instead of warlike purposes.

“Influence of the Temperature of Liquid Hydrogen on Bacteria.”

By ALLAN MACFADYEN, M.D., and SYDNEY ROWLAND, M.A.

Communicated by LORD LISTER, P.R.S. Received and read May 31, 1900.

In a previous communication we have shown that the temperature of liquid air has no appreciable effect upon the vitality of micro-organisms, even when they were exposed to this temperature for one week (about $-190^{\circ}\text{C}.$).†

We have now been able to execute preliminary experiments projected in our last paper as to the effect of a temperature as low as that of liquid hydrogen on bacterial life. As the approximate temperature of the air may be taken as 300° absolute, and liquid air as 80° absolute, hydrogen as 21° absolute, the ratio of these temperatures roughly is respectively as 15 : 4 : 1. In other words, then, the temperature of liquid hydrogen is about one-quarter that of liquid air, just as that of liquid air is about one-quarter of that of the average mean temperature. In subjecting bacteria, therefore, to the temperature of liquid hydrogen, we place them under conditions which, in severity of temperature, are as far removed from those of liquid air as are those of liquid air from that of the average summer temperature. By the kindness of Professor Dewar, the specimens of bacteria were cooled in liquid hydrogen at the Royal Institution. The following organisms were employed: *Bac. acidi lactici*, *B. typhosus*, *B. diphtheriæ*, *Proteus vulgaris*, *B. anthracis*, *B. coli communis*, *Staphylococcus pyogenes aureus*, *Spirillum cholerae*, *B. phosphorescens*, *B. pyocyaneus*, a *Sarcina*, and a yeast.

The above organisms in broth culture were sealed in thin glass tubes

* See also a paper by M. E. T. Hamy in the ‘Bulletin du Muséum d’Histoire-Naturelle,’ 1899, No. 6, p. 270.

† ‘Roy. Soc. Proc.,’ February 1, 1900; *ibid.*, April 5, 1900.